Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.5%. These data epresent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 90%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that 14 of 15 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding was subsequently corrected by January 2009.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §\$303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.
		When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §\$303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of API	R Data/SPP Revision I	ssues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
				State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.  [Results Indicator]	The State revised the indicator a revisions in the Indicator Measu this indicator, and OSEP accepts. The State's FFY 2008 reported data reflect a high level of performance of FFY 2008 target of 95%.	rement Table) and imposit sthose revisions.  data for this indicator as	rovement activities for re 98.4%. The State's	The State's actual target data for provision of services to infants and toddlers in natural environments are at or greater than 95%. There is no expectation that an increase in that percentage is necessary. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and assumes that the State is monitoring to ensure that IFSP teams are making service setting decisions on an individualized basis and in compliance with 34 CFR §§303.12, 303.18, and 303.344(d)(1)(ii).
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.			The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationship); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including	The State provided FFY 2008 b activities for this indicator and C indicator.	OSEP accepts the State'	s submission for this	
early language/communication);	The State's FFY 2008 reported	baseline data for this in	dicator are:	
and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	08-09 Infant and Toddler Outcome Baseline Data	Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2 <sup>2</sup>	
[Results Indicator]	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	96.7	97.9	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps		
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	93.8		87.0		
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	96.0		92.9		
	The State serves infants and todd developmental delays. The State aggregate progress data for all of C (including developmentally deconditions, and at-risk infants and	reported separate the infants and to layed children, cl	ely in its I oddlers it	FFY 2008 serves und	der Part	
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's reported data for this indicator are:			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.		
A. Know their rights; B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	
C. Help their children develop and	A. Know their rights (%)	77.6	78.6	71	1.00%	
learn. [Results Indicator]	B. Effectively communicate the children's needs (%)	74.6	75.1	71	0.50%	
	C. Help their children develop learn. (%)	and 85.6	86.3	86	0.70%	
	These data represent progress fro its FFY 2008 targets for this indicates the control of the con		data. The	State me	t all of	
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.			vities for	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.	
[Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported d	ata for this indica	tor are 2.	31%. The	se data	

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 3.12%. The State did not meet	
	its FFY 2008 target of 2.85%.	
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.	The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
[Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 6.42%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 6.72%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 5.85%.	
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 96.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that all eight of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the 45-day timeline requirements in 34 CFR §\$303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.  When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §\$303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation,
		assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  If the State does not report 100%
		compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;  [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that all three of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the IFSP transition content requirements in 34 CFR §\$303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.  When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §\$303.148(b)(4) and 303.344(h) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data
		system; and (2) has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
		If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:  B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data, submitted on February 1, 2010, for this indicator were 99.2%. However, the State acknowledged that it did not provide valid and reliable data using the correct measurement for this indicator, because its data were based only on children who had received six months or more of services. In its July 26, 2010 letter submitted as part of its June 14, 2010 determination appeal, the State submitted updated data for Indicator 8B from each of its 58 Early Intervention Programs that reflect the correct measurement for this indicator. Specifically, Massachusetts submitted data on "all IFSP children discharged between January 1, 2009 and March 31, 2009," and identified 272 additional children "discharged and potentially eligible for Part B."  The State's revised data FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 99.4%. These data represent progress from the State's FFY 2007 data of 95.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported in its FFY 2008 APR submitted on February 1, 2010 that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the LEA notification requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.  When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has provided notification to the LEA for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program (i.e., the child has exited the State's Part C program due to age or other reasons), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
		If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 93.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 99.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.	The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.
		When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
		If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
9. General Supervision system (including monitoring complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that 35 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding was subsequently corrected by January, 2009.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 in accordance with IDEA section 635(a)(10)(A), 34 CFR §303.501, and OSEP Memo 09-02.  In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance for this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		activities and revise them, if necessary.
		In addition, in reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.
		Further, in responding to Indicators 1,7, and 8A, 8B, and 8C in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.
10. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.	The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.	
[Compliance Indicator]		
11. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.	The State reported that it did not receive any requests for due process hearings during the reporting period.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
[Compliance Indicator]		
12. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).  [Results Indicator]	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
13. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.  [Results Indicator]	The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.  The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities except in any fiscal	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	year in which ten or more mediations were held.	
14. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.  [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616, 618, and 642 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 303.540. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.  In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.